

what is our life like? What about us? What is the situation in my job? Am I being paid more or less? Am I making progress or falling behind? Is my wage up, or is it deteriorating? Is my job more or less secure? What about my child, who is ready to go to college? Is the economy expanding sufficiently so that that child is going to have an opportunity to get some interviews and maybe have a choice of a job or two?

That is the central question. Those who believe they should scare this country into accepting a rate of economic growth of 2 or 2.5 percent, and decide that the standard practice in this country is to revel in bad economic news and despair in good economic news, have done a real disservice to the potential of this country's economy. Felix Rohatyn is fundamentally right. It is a false choice for us now in the global economy when wages have been going down, not up, to say that we must choose between economic growth or more inflation.

I do not want more inflation. I do not think it serves this country's interest. Inflation has been coming down for 5 years in a row. If you believe Alan Greenspan, that the consumer price index overstates inflation by a percent and a half, we have almost no inflation in America today. Yet, we have all these micromanagers who see themselves in the hold or the engine room of a ship of state, operating the controls to try to slow the ship down. My Uncle Joe could slow the ship down. If that is the job description of the Fed for serving on Wall Street, my Uncle Joe can do that job. I want this country to have an economy that expands and produces more jobs and better wages.

Mr. WYDEN. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. DORGAN. I am happy to yield.

Mr. WYDEN. I share the Senator's interest in this Rohatyn analysis. What is interesting is that there really is a link between the growth issue and those concerns of working families that the Senator from North Dakota is right to zero in on.

There was a study a couple of weeks ago, a Census Bureau study, that showed that the gap between those at the very top and those at the bottom is widening again and, well, it confirms what a lot of us suspected. But there was also another study that did not get the attention, frankly, it should have, which said that the education gap is widening between folks at the top and folks at the bottom.

So there really is a link, a kind of interdependence between the issues that the Senator is talking about. We ought to be looking at a noninflationary economic growth rate that I think is increased beyond where we are today. I think we can get it if Democrats and Republicans in this body come together and pass the kind of policies that will complement that.

For example, if you want to attack that education gap, which was the study I mentioned last week, which complemented what the Census Depart-

ment said, education is really the key. A lot of us here have said that what we ought to do, on a bipartisan basis, is say that when working families are making payments for college or vocational education, let us make that tax deductible. Let us let them write that off, so that we have a tax cut geared directly toward working families trying to deal with that wage crunch that the Senator from North Dakota is talking about. It gives us an opportunity to have the kind of growth that Felix Rohatyn and others are talking about.

I think the Senator is very much on target in bringing these issues up. There certainly is not anything partisan about these kinds of questions. I hope that as we go into the last few weeks of the session, this is the kind of approach we should take. I thank the Senator for letting me work with him on this morning's discussion.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Oregon, Senator WYDEN, for coming this morning, as well as Senator CONRAD and Senator FORD. Again, what he said last is, I think, most important. The Senate will work its will on issues. But we cannot have a circumstance where we are told we have made the decision in some room someplace, and we are bringing it to the floor, and we are cutting off your right to debate it and accept it, or else. That is not the way the Senate can work.

Most of us are anxious to work with the majority to get things done. I say that, despite the anxiety of the end of the week on the legislation that was pending, this was actually a pretty productive week in the Senate. We passed some very substantial pieces of legislation dealing with the minimum wage, with small business regulatory issues, and tax issues that will be very helpful to small business. The Defense authorization bill was passed on final passage. This was actually a productive week. I hope future weeks will be as productive. Our intention is to work, in a serious and conscientious way, with the majority. But we will not be rolled over by people who insist on doing things that prevent us from being part of the debate. That is a message that they need to understand, and I hope they will understand.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In my capacity as a Senator from Alaska, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

IN REMEMBRANCE OF LEE SCHOENHARD

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I rise today to honor the memory of Leland

"Lee" Schoenhard, a good friend and one of the most charitable men South Dakota has ever known.

At the age of 4, Lee Schoenhard moved with his family to South Dakota in 1924. At the young age of 17, he moved to Chamberlain, SD, to begin a career in farming. He would change careers often in life. At different times, he made a living in the construction, trucking, and the lumber businesses. In 1965, he built and opened Lee's Motor Inn, a 60-unit motel that is still one of the finest places to stay in Central South Dakota. From 1973 to 1977, he owned and operated the Missouri Valley Grain Co. as well as a feed lot in central South Dakota that fed over 80,000 cattle. Lee's hard work and keen sense of business turned almost every opportunity he encountered into a success. Despite having attained only a sixth grade education, he became one of the most successful and wealthy businessmen in the State of South Dakota.

But, Lee Schoenhard's wealth extended far beyond his earnings.

After he passed away last month, Lee was remembered, not as a man of riches but rather as a man of compassion, and the fond recollections of the people he helped will forever remain the most powerful public statement that can be made about his life. People will remember him driving over 18,000 miles in 4 months to raise money for a hospital in Lyman County. They will remember the 22 carloads of scrap iron and the 500 carloads of wheat straw that he bought and delivered to the Army for material purposes in World War II. They will remember the \$9,000 he gave every year in scholarships for area school children, and the \$1 million foundation he created to fund community projects in his hometown and surrounding areas. Through these and other numerous gifts, his wealth will continue to help South Dakotans into the next century, and it is in these acts of kindness that the memory of Lee Schoenhard will continue to live.

I will remember Lee Schoenhard as a dear friend, and can truly say he was among the wisest and most caring men I have known. He embodied the South Dakota spirit with a kind and honest heart, and we will all miss him greatly.

SAUDI ARABIA BOMBING

Mr. KERREY. Mr. President, I rise to comment on a disturbing trend I see arising in the aftermath of the terrorist killing of our military personnel in Saudi Arabia. I am concerned because I believe we may be developing a response that plays right into the terrorists' hands.

I frankly question some of the responses coming out of the Congress. Some of these responses neglect answering the fundamental question: Why did the terrorists choose to kill Americans in Dhahran on June 25, 1996? This question is fundamental because if you answer it, you will immediately

reach some conclusions about the right and wrong response to the bombing.

I say to my colleagues, in order to understand the next steps we should be taking as a nation, you must try to put yourself in the mind of the terrorists to determine what they want. Based on all of the rhetoric and the history of terrorism in this region, there are, in my view, at least three things the terrorists want to have happen as a result of their attacks. First, they want to divide Saudi Arabia from the United States. Second, they want to force the United States out of Saudi Arabia. Third, they want to make it more difficult for the United States to deploy its forces overseas.

If these are in fact the goals of the terrorists, and I believe they are, some reactions in Congress and the media are playing right into the terrorists' hands. I have heard implications that cast doubt on the competence of the military chain of command to protect the troops. I have heard doubt cast on the sincerity and willingness of an important ally to cooperate with the United States. I have heard speculation about the stability of the government of that important ally. If I were the terrorist, I'd be pleased at these reactions and be confident that one more spectacular attack might just be good enough to finish the job and drive the Americans out of the region.

I say to my colleagues, these are not the appropriate responses when we are at war. And believe me, whoever they may be, the terrorists have declared war on the United States. And I think we can all agree, when we are at war, the appropriate response is not to do what your enemy wants.

The appropriate response is to support our military and its commanders. The appropriate response is to praise the airmen at Al Khobar Towers for the dedication and alertness which prevented greater casualties in the attack. The appropriate response is to pile on all of the intelligence and war-fighting resources we can marshal so as to put the perpetrators out of business and to punish their state sponsor, if we find one. The appropriate response is to be sure our troops enjoy the maximum protection consistent with the mission. The appropriate response is to continue with our vital mission in Saudi Arabia.

Mr. President, we should be making it clear, right now, the United States is angry. But we are not angry because a barrier was too close to a building. We should be making it very clear we are angry because someone attacked us. That someone should understand they are the focus of our anger, not our military commanders. We should be confirming our commitment the United States will not leave Saudi Arabia. We should make sure our enemy understands they will be punished and their organization will be destroyed. And this will happen to them no matter how far we have to go or how long it takes.

We Americans proved during Desert Storm that we will support a 72-hour

war. We now need to prove we will support a war that lasts 72 weeks—or however long it takes to defeat this enemy.

The nervousness over vulnerabilities, the second-guessing of the chain of command, the search for an exit strategy should be going on in the terrorists' lair—not in the United States. Let's focus the anger where it belongs.

FLAWED ELECTIONS IN NIGER

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. Mr. President, early this week, the people of the Republic of Niger were denied their right to choose their own leadership and control their destiny. I want to express my deep disappointment in the Nigerian elections and in the military regime that chose to retain power through fraud and intimidation rather than honor its word to hold free and fair elections.

In January, immediately after Gen. Ibrahim Barre Mainassara deposed Niger's democratically elected president in a military coup, he pledged to return the country to democracy as soon as possible. At that time, the United States rejected the use of military solutions for political problems by suspending bilateral development and military assistance, as well as support for Niger in multilateral financial institutions. We urged Barre to keep his word and encouraged the military government to reestablish democracy quickly and transparently.

Balloting started on Sunday, despite the fact that the Independent Electoral Commission had twice requested a postponement in order to ensure that accurate voter lists and voter cares were in place. General Barre rejected these requests and, instead, extended the voting through Monday. On this second day of balloting, the general deployed security forces to the homes of his opponents, shut down private radio stations—including the Voice of America affiliate—and dissolved the Independent Electoral Commission.

Barre appointed a new commission which declared him the winner only hours later. Quickly after that declaration all demonstrations and public assemblies were banned. Political leaders are under house arrest, and political activists are being detained.

Mr. President, I join with the administration and other members of the international community in condemning these recent events. The age of accepting military coups and authoritarian regimes in Africa is over. France, with its unique influence in Niger, can have an especially powerful voice in articulating this message. For this reason, it is particularly disturbing that the bilateral French delegation on the ground claimed that, by Nigerian standards, this weekend's election was a sound one.

In this era of change and growth throughout much of the African Continent, Niger now stands out as a country moving against the tide of openness and progress. Development and eco-

nomie growth cannot be achieved in a climate of instability, and human potential cannot be realized in an atmosphere of fear. If the people of Niger are to find their much-deserved place among the emerging markets and developing nations of Africa, Niger must return to democracy.

REPUBLICAN BUDGET SUPPORTS STUDENT AID

Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. President, today I would like to express my continued support for Federal student financial aid programs. I relied on student loans to fund my college education at the University of South Dakota, so I understand the importance of these loans for students and families. Low income levels should not deny young people the opportunity to achieve their dream of a college education. Programs such as Stafford loans, Pell Grants, and work study programs enable young people to fulfill that dream and pursue their ultimate dreams of personal and professional success.

One of the great challenges for American families is the rising cost of a college education. For the past two decades, tuition costs have risen twice as fast as inflation. Financial aid has not kept pace with these soaring price increases. The result? More and more students and their families are struggling to pay for college today. In my home State of South Dakota, 83 percent of students attending public colleges receive some type of Federal financial aid. As the number of students receiving loans continues to grow, the overall student aid debt accumulates along with it. Even more of a concern, the rising cost of tuition increases the size of the debt students pay off after college. South Dakota students now graduate with an average debt of more than \$10,000. This means that college graduates are forced to divert a higher share of their earnings in order to pay off their student debts.

Students struggle to find ways to pay off these huge debts. Increasingly, they work while attending school. This trend tends to deflate the student's educational experience.

I am pleased the Republican budget that passed Congress earlier this year would respond to these trends. The budget includes responsible, cost-efficient reforms to student financial aid programs. These programs can be improved without harming the actual aid levels that students depend on. Reform can be achieved by eliminating small, specialized scholarship programs and Federal bureaucracy.

Unfortunately, liberal interests have tried to use the issue of student financial aid to their benefit. They have used false propaganda to scare young people and their parents. I urge Americans to look at the facts, not the falsehoods. The Republican plan for student aid would increase the amount of aid available to students, while downsizing inefficient Federal bureaucracy.